

SCAAC Meeting Minutes

(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

March 28, 2000
State Board Room

SCAAC Agenda

#	Agenda Items	Presenters
1.	Meeting Minutes	Benny Lile
2.	Gender and Race Study	Scott Trimble
3.	Writing On-demand Scoring	Scott Trimble
4.	Student Accountability	Scott Trimble
5.	Contrasting Groups Study (Update)	Scott Trimble
6.	Jaeger Mills and CTBS Benchmark Procedures	Scott Trimble
7.	Legislative Update	Kevin Noland
8.	Longitudinal Study (Update)	Scott Trimble
9.	School ReportCard	Scott Trimble
10.	Disaggregation of Data	Scott Trimble
11.	Interim Accountability	Scott Trimble
12.	District Accountability	Scott Trimble
13.	Sensitivity Guidelines	Scott Trimble
Adjournment		

SCAAC Meeting Minutes
March 28, 2000

Copies of audiotapes of the meeting are available upon request.

Chairman Benny Lyle called the meeting to order. The roll was called.

Members Present:

Dale Campbell	Gary Mielcarek	Nancy Sutton
Suzanne Guyer	Roger Pankratz	Maynard Thomas
Benny Lile	Bob Sexton	Sharon Whitworth
Bonny Lynch	Linda Sheffield	Robert Young

1. Meeting Minutes

Benny Lile

January 25, 2000 minutes approved.

2. Gender and Race Study

Scott Trimble

Doug Smith Study

As we review the data we see that all students are increasing in performance, but there is a gap between subpopulations. White females are at the top of the distribution. Doug Smith's study finds the gap is getting slightly wider. We observe that the gap is certainly present and is not getting narrower. The fact that the gap exists at all is a concern. We'd like to see all the lines on the graphs line up, but we would like to see the lines converge as they do. We are seeing the same trend across years of data. We feel like we have fairly consistent data.

Gene Wilhoit shared with the Council that a Task Force would be formed to look at these issues. A cross-section of people will be brought together to review the data and make recommendations to the Kentucky Department of Education as to what can be done to make a difference for public schools in addressing these issues. The recommendations of the Task Force will be brought to the Council. We are serious about this work. There are some districts that have a significant population of African American students and we need to target these areas. We will have representatives from these districts on the Task Force. Out of this effort there will be initiatives from the department to assist schools in addressing these issues. A report from the Task Force is expected by the end of the year. The Kentucky Board of Education will sanction this project month and we will begin the work.

SCAAC Comments/Questions:

Do we know what the problem is that results in the data continuing to show these gaps? Context makes the difference. Are we training teachers to be able to address these issues? The reason we're getting these results is because we have always gotten these results. What is causing this gap?

KDE Response:

This data distribution is not unique to Kentucky. There are multiple things going on in schools. Students generally attend school in a white, middle class environment. Curriculum and instructional patterns should match the needs of students. The placement of youngsters in certain curriculum paths and the offerings they exposed to in curriculum need to be examined. There is not a simple and quick solution. The idea of a partnership with these districts is important and creates a very complex dynamic.

SCAAC Questions:

What is the definition of minority? Are we looking at Socio-Economic Status and other subpopulations or just race?

KDE Response:

We will look at the others too.

We do need to keep in mind that the data we are reviewing is self-reported and if there are 10 or fewer students in a category, we do not report the data due to student confidentiality issues.

The 1999 data displayed in the bar graphs show the novice, apprentice, and proficient/distinguished distributions. We have some problems in the technical community with the presentation of this data, but the conclusion remains the same. When analyzing the 1999 white/non-white regional data it is important to note that Kentucky's African American student population is not concentrated equally in the state, but in about 10 districts. The number of students in a district versus the percent of African American students are both important.

SCAAC Comments/Question:

It looks like the differences are pretty significant. The pattern doesn't deviate from region to region in that the percent of students in the novice and apprentice performance levels are higher. There certainly seems to be regional differences. Why aren't we doing something about the differences we see in this data?

KDE Response:

This is a statewide problem.

SCAAC Comments:

This data is not surprising. Educational articles discuss this and attempt to identify some contributors. For example, one article stated that some students in our subpopulations

watch more TV than others. We know there are a multitude of environmental issues that may contribute to student performance.

KDE Response:

When we used different assessments, the data looked different. Another piece of data that doesn't come through clearly is that when Kentucky is compared to the nation, performance of white students is below the nation's performance of the white population. On the other hand the performance of African American students is at or slightly above the nation's African American population. This shouldn't make us feel better or worse, its just part of the data.

SCAAC Comments:

Not only does the gender information look different, it looks different than other data we review. For example, there seems to be a much greater difference here than in ACT data.

KDE Response:

The gender differences we see are not so unlike other states. When testing programs change the assessments like has happened between ACT, where males out perform females on a totally multiple-choice assessment, and the Kentucky Core Content Test, where females out perform males on an assessment that is 2/3 open-response items, this same pattern emerges. Females perform better on a written format than males do.

SCAAC Comments:

The big difference in writing scores is worth looking at to see why it's happening. It would be good to review this data school by school and see if people can begin to understand why this is happening.

KDE Response:

It's important to know that items are reviewed/generated/approved by Kentucky teachers in each content area. We also have a BIAS review committee that weeds out items that have biases.

SCAAC Comment:

It may be in part because we have had more males that have blown off the test versus females.

KDE Response:

We need to examine more closely the connection of this and the results to the Student Questionnaire. We ask students questions about how hard they try on the test.

SCAAC Comments:

We've known for years that ACT and SAT is biased toward males but we continue to put a lot of money into these tests and scholarships. If we know that our test is biased toward females then we need to use this data to balance some of the biases.

Minority Student Achievement Taskforce Document

To simply continue to report the data, but not to look into what is going on with instruction for students in our subpopulations is not going to move us in the right direction. We need to know what type of curriculum is needed to get students where they need to be. We have some data that will help us, but are cautious with this data (e.g., free and reduced lunch data). Be aware that poverty data looks different at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels. As students get older they are more reluctant to code free and reduced lunch correctly or even take advantage of the free and red lunch program. Some of the drop in data is real (some families get in better financial shape as their children get older), so be cautious when analyzing this data.

SCAAC Comments:

Some don't realize that the student performance differences between male/female students with disabilities goes through middle school and high school levels. These differences are more commonly noted at the elementary level. Special education teachers in high school with no math background do not offer the same math curriculum to students with disabilities that other students receive.

KDE Response:

This data poses curriculum questions that are important. While we can't rely on high schools alone to fix this, we know there are a lot of issues that need to be addressed. After reviewing this data, does the Council think we are we moving along the right track in producing data like this? Are we producing the right kind of information to support the process to improve education?

SCAAC Comments/Questions:

Yes, this data is very useful. Is there any other indicator we could use to be a proxy for Socio-Economics Status? We need to show districts schools that are doing a good job with minorities. We'd like to find out what some schools are doing well and share this information with other schools. Is it possible to run some numbers that would calculate how Kentucky would compare with other states in National Assessment Education of Progress if black students performed the same as white students? Most people would understand the issues more clearly if they could see this kind of comparison. The point, find some way to show what it would mean if the gap were closed. We have to help overcome difficulties students have that come from single parent families with a low education level. There may be things we can do to help students through our Family Resource Service Centers. Don't get into so many other variables that we lose the importance of this one.

KDE Response:

Not that we have in the department. Our intent is to begin to look for sites that perform

well. We have a communication plan in mind to make the schools know they are part of the plan.

Timeline for the Task Force

Announcement the Tasks Force to the Kentucky Board of Education	June 2000
Task Force will meet	May 2000
Task Force will produce an interim report	September 2000
Task Force will make final recommendations to KBE	December 2000

3. Writing On-demand Scoring

Scott Trimble

In recent meetings with District Assessment Coordinators, it was understood that not everyone knew how the on-demand writing was scored versus the portfolio. There is a gap in student performance on the on-demand writing compared to the portfolio. We will take this issue back to District Assessment Coordinators to explain that both writing assessments are scored with the same holistic scoring guide. The Writing Advisory Committee advised us to do this and we will continue.

We are rewriting standards in all areas but writing. The writing teachers in Step 1 of the Standards setting process and the Writing Advisory Committee recommended that we not change standards in writing.

SCAAC Comments:

Teachers need a whole lot more information on the on-demand writing for classroom support. On-demand writing requires a different style of writing. We need a lot more information to show novice, apprentice, proficient, and distinguished performances on the on-demand writing prompts.

KDE Response:

We think we are going to describe for District Assessment Coordinators a history/rationale and provide access to training. We're looking to our contractors to pull a range of papers to annotate and release for teachers. We're also looking at writing cluster leaders to more widely distribute materials.

4. Student Accountability

Scott Trimble

The student accountability issue remains with us. We spent two days with the National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) and one full day was spent on student accountability. NTAPAA reviewed a draft paper on student

accountability that our staff put together. NTAPAA has given us some edits that we are putting in a new draft to distribute to the panel (Draft 3). This version will be taken to Kentucky Board of Education in June. We are serious about meeting the June timeline. When Draft 3 is completed, we will distribute it to you electronically. We've gotten advice from technical experts that we need to be cautious of other uses of our assessment other than those for which it was designed. NTAPAA reviewed and commented on the following student accountability initiatives.

Student Transcript – if there comes to be fairly significant consequences for students due to results being put on student transcripts, then we would need to redesign assessments.

KEES – at first this initiative was not met well, but as panel members began to see that results would be part of a broader set of data points, they were more considerate of this proposal. They were concerned about the whole process for scholarships. They felt there needs to be a considerate number of opportunities for students to earn money in this scholarship process. They questioned whether this proposal would reach students who may not go on to post secondary education? Also, this might be norm referenced so if you were in a particular school (high or low scoring) it may be unfair.

Gateway Skills – the Panel thought we had not defined this one well. They advised that we need to be cautious and questioned whether or not there needs to be any emphasis on the state assessment program. They were a little more comfortable in putting this and the plan to use CTBS scores to predict performance on the Kentucky Core Content Test together.

Part of course grades – the Panel thought it would be very difficult for us to implement this one.

Good Faith Effort Policies – the Panel felt good about this one because it doesn't focus on quality of work, but effort. NTAPAA feels we should be focused on student motivation instead of student accountability.

We will redraft the paper based on NTAPAA's comments. They will review the paper again and we will make additional changes. Then we will begin to distribute to focus groups, the Council included.

SCAAC Question:

What happened to the connection between student accountability and the Scholastic Audit the Council suggested before?

KDE Response:

It has been discussed and while it is not part of the regulation, folks feel like we will get some sense of student accountability through the audits. One thing we are trying to do is use the student questionnaire to put data together that gets at how hard students try.

5. Contrasting Groups Study (Update)

Scott Trimble

The Contrasting Groups study is one of the 3 standard setting procedures. We ask teachers to use the draft performance descriptors to categorize student work. Staff has pulled the sample of schools. Teachers review our draft descriptors and come to some conclusion based on student observations thru classroom interactions and assessments as to what performance level best reflects novice, apprentice, proficient, and distinguished.

We selected 50 schools across the state and at least 2 teachers to rate their students' work. Data will be collected by April 15th. This data will be compared to students' actual performance on the 2000 Kentucky Core Content Test. This will result in one of 3 sets of cut scores. We will ask a set of people to synthesize all the data gathered through each of the 3 procedures toward the end of the process.

SCAAC Comment/Question:

You say the Department is not addressing writing in the standards setting process, but we are graduating students from subpopulations that do not meet the standards. Is this a serious problem we need to look at?

KDE Response:

It's an instructional problem, not a standards issue.

SCAAC Question:

Has there been a comparison of success transition data to students' scores in writing?

KDE Response:

No, nor in any other content area.

SCAAC Question:

What does student performance data look like for students going on to postsecondary education?

KDE Response:

We will have to examine the data to see.

6. Jaeger Mills and CTBS Benchmark Procedures

Scott Trimble

About 450 teachers will be involved in the Jaeger-Mills and the CTB Bookmark procedures.

We are trying to find space to schedule the Jaeger-Mills work this October. There will be about 20-25 teachers in each content area at each grade level involved. Teachers will be asked to review student work and place it in the novice, apprentice, proficient, or

distinguished category. There will also be a place for borderline papers. The CTB Bookmark procedure will be conducted in December. Work will come together in 2001 and recommendations are expected to go to the Kentucky Board of Education in April 2001.

SCAAC Question:

Is purpose of the Jaeger-Mills procedure to see if teachers understand the standards?

KDE Response:

Teachers involved in the Contrasting Groups procedure are looking at student work in the classroom. In the CTB Bookmark procedure teachers don't know the students, but look at student work.

The Jaeger-Mills procedure replicates teacher's thoughts on what the standards should be.

SCAAC Question:

Where is the "give" going to be if the results from the Jaeger-Mills procedure are different than CTB Bookmark procedure?

KDE Response:

In this standards setting process, the "old" performance descriptors were set aside. Teachers came together and wrote what would describe novice, apprentice, proficient, and distinguished. Then, these descriptors are used in Jaeger-Mills and CTB Bookmark procedures.

Teachers have described these standards better than ever before and these will be used in every step.

Copies of the descriptors as the teachers wrote them will be e-mailed to Council members.

SCAAC Question:

When all of the data is collected in each Step of process involving teachers, what happens then?

KDE Response:

We'll bring together a group that is a majority of teachers, along with District Assessment Coordinators, administrators, etc. that will bring data together to make recommendations to the Kentucky Board of Education. This committee will have the initial descriptors and then they will look at the three different sets of cut scores and recommend to the Kentucky Board of Education what the final cut scores should be.

7. Legislative Update

Kevin Noland

Odds are there will not be a budget passed this week. If legislators go home without a budget, they will reconvene in May or June to vote on a budget. The Senate and House are pretty far apart on the budget. They do agree on the budget for assessment and accountability.

8. Longitudinal Study (Update)

Scott Trimble

Legislators are very interested in seeing that we build in an expectation that longitudinal assessments will be a part of the accountability program.

Longitudinal Study #2 is the one that NTAPAA suggested. In this study, we are re-testing students who scored novice and apprentice in reading and math. Schools have volunteered to participate.

Study 1 is the one that attempts to predict student performance on the Kentucky Core Content Test from performance on the CTBS/5 in the areas of reading and math. The correlation is expected to be about 0.6.

SCAAC Question:

What are the implications of Study 1?

KDE Response:

0.6 doesn't mean a real strong useful correlation. It's not strong enough to use in accountability.

9. School Report Card

Scott Trimble

We have received both positive comments and some constructive advice from the pilot of the School Report Card. The following have been concerns and are being addressed as the work moves forward to promulgate a regulation.

- Calculations regarding teacher certification data
- School Safety data
- Parent involvement
- Financial data calculating per pupil expenditures

The proposed regulation goes to the Kentucky Board of Education this month (March 31) for the intent to promulgate. After that it will still be open for public review and comment.

SCAAC Comments:

Whether or not a school offers advanced placement courses and dual-credit classes and what percent of students complete these programs should be reflected in the School Report Card. A distinction needs to be made as to whether students completed the courses for these programs or whether a testing option was available and students gained credit through these assessments. The School Report Card needs to include whether or not the school/district offers a Commonwealth Diploma. Whether or not students of the school participate in the Virtual High School Program needs to be on the School Report Card. We need more information on the Virtual High School.

KDE Response:

We will put the Virtual High School on the next council meeting agenda and have someone come and speak to us.

10. Disaggregation of Data

Scott Trimble

We have quite a bit of data disaggregated for analysis. However, we will be able to disaggregate data in a more comprehensive manner once a data system is in place to allow us to collect more individual student data than we are able to now. A data system plan is being discussed with the intent to streamline data collection for schools. If all schools use the same software, we can generate labels for testing rather than asking teachers to bubble in student information. Collecting the data once will result in more accurate data at the individual student level.

SCAAC Comments/Question:

Is there a manual that explains to school staff how to use the disaggregated data provided on the school reports? School districts have difficulty knowing what equity components are. If they understand that the disaggregated pages are equity components it would help. In the regional consolidated planning meetings the use of this data is discussed. The Kentucky Department of Education provides an Interpretive Guide for the reports. Item analyses are done on the disaggregated pages. We need to learn how to use this data.

Site Based Decision Making Council training will help with this.

KDE Response:

The department will stay open to how we might help districts and schools use this data.

The department in conjunction with district staff that uses the reports developed the Kentucky Performance Report that includes the disaggregated data. We also worked with the staff in Consolidated Planning to ensure that the reports met the needs of the Consolidated Plan. Staff in the Office of Assessment and Accountability is reaching out to Regional Service Center staff, the Professional Development Matrix Team, and the Highly Skilled Educators to explain how to use the reports. Staff in the Division of

Assessment Implementation meet with the district assessment coordinators of each district and review the reports.

11. Interim Accountability

Scott Trimble

The Interim Accountability Reports will be distributed by September 15, 2000. There are several issues regarding interim accountability that will be reviewed by the Kentucky Board of Education in their March meeting. They are:

Issue #1: Fairness

- Regulation requirements regarding options that could be exercised by reconfigured schools were changed (Cycle 3 to Interim – Interim to Long-Term).
- The Cycle 3 governing regulations permitted schools reconfigured in the second year of the baseline to choose to either be held accountable through the aggregate district (appropriate grade levels) or to establish a baseline to which its own growth would be compared using the second year of the baseline (1997-1998).
- The interim accountability regulation (703 KAR 5:060) does not include the above local option but requires such schools to be held accountable by establishing a baseline using the 1997-1998 (second year baseline) data and comparing that school's growth data (1998-1999 and 1999-2000) to that single year baseline.
- The option was deleted from the interim regulation because neither local schools nor the Department had been effective in exercising this option prior to the years in which the growth data were collected. Decisions had to be made sometime after the first year of growth data were reported.
- The complexity and timing of the interim process made it cleaner to simply treat all reconfigured schools the same and to choose an alternative that met the needs of most reconfigured schools.
- The appeals process would still be applicable to any school considered to be disadvantaged by the sequence of regulatory changes.
- The long-term accountability process (703 KAR 5:020) does permit some flexibility; a school can accept the district (grade appropriate) goal and assistance lines or provide a plan for generating an appropriate 1998-1999 and 1999-2000 baseline on which new goals and assistance lines will be based. If a school and district chooses this second option, the details must be submitted to the Department for approval by September 30 of the year in which the reconfiguration takes place.

Issue #2: Labels

- There are schools scoring at high index levels, some above 80, on the 1999 accountability index who could be labeled “assistance” on September 15, 2000.
- These schools may feel unfairly labeled in that they are still scoring well above most other schools, some of which will be eligible for rewards or considered “progressing.”
- These schools may still be well below the current goal of 100. This could be complicated in that we are reestablishing standards in the winter of 2001. The effect of this on the 1999 and 2000 data will be apparent when long-term baselines are published.

Issue #3: SBDM Exemptions

- The concerns are related to the approval and/or continuing of exemptions from requirements to have an SBDM Council.
- The current statute permits an exemption from SBDM Council requirements when a school exceeds the state established threshold.
- The old concept of threshold and that evident in the long-term accountability model (703 KAR 5:020) both are associated with the expectation that exemptions are appropriate when schools are making adequate growth toward the state established goal. The interim accountability model (703 KAR 5:060) does not adequately address the concept of growth because the scales used under the KIRIS system and those used under the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System are substantively different.
- The Kentucky Board of Education may consider two (or a combination of the two) policies applicable to the interim accountability decisions.
- The Kentucky Board of Education could continue exemptions currently in place because there is insufficient “growth” data on which to revoke these exemptions, or on which to approve new exemptions.
- The Kentucky Board of Education could approve exemptions for only those schools exceeding their predicted performance and continuing exemptions only for schools meeting this standard.

Issue #4: Assistance

- The interim scholastic audit should apply to the lowest one third of the schools scoring one standard error of estimate or more below their predicted performance.
- The questions of how far up the distribution of these schools that Commonwealth School Improvement Funds can meaningfully reach should be resolved.
- High scoring schools that would otherwise be labeled “assistance” but for whom no assistance can be supplied should be labeled otherwise (i.e., performing satisfactorily).

Issue #5: Interim Reward Shares

- The concerns center around calculation of shares in the interim accountability (703 KAR 5:060) as opposed to the long-term accountability process (703 KAR 5:020). The interim language does not address the numbers of shares on which reward calculations are based, while the long-term language is specific and defines multiple levels or shares of rewards.
- During the interim, there will be one reward amount calculated by dividing the total reward amount by the total number of teachers in schools earning rewards in the interim cycle. The maximum reward share and the total amount of rewards distributed to schools will be consistent with the language provided in 703 KAR 5:020.

12. District Accountability

Scott Trimble

The district accountability regulation will go the March Kentucky Board of Education meeting for final action. Sections 2 and 3 are of particular interest.

Section 2: A district in which A2-A6 schools are housed may request that the dropout data be assigned to the A1 school that would have served them had they not required services offered by the A2-A6 school or schools. Otherwise, this dropout data will be attributed to the district in which the A2-A6 school is housed.

- The department recognizes the need to track all academic and nonacademic data for individual students back to the accountable A1 schools that would have served the students had they not had the need of special services provided by the A2-A6 facilities they attend.
- Until a student management system can be implemented at the state level that would allow the tracking of all data to the accountable schools, Section 2 of this proposed regulation offers a short-term solution for assigning the dropout data to the accountable A1 School for districts who chose to do so.

- The department views this solution as a bridge between not being able to track any nonacademic data to the accountable A1 school and being able to track all of the data back to the A1 until a system is in place to allow it.
- Section 3: A local school district in which all schools are classified as progressing or meets goal...and meets the dropout criteria shall be declared an exemplary district and shall receive rewards as determined by the Kentucky Board of Education.
- Language has been added that will hold districts accountable to the same standard for dropouts that schools are in order to be considered for reward. (i.e., for a district to be considered an “exemplary” district, the district must meet the same dropout criteria established for reward schools).

SCAAC Question:

What if a district cannot locate the accountable A1 School for a student who is being served in one of its on-A1 schools?

KDE Response:

We will check the language in the regulation and make sure this concern is discussed in the regulatory process.

13. Sensitivity Guidelines

Scott Trimble

The document, *Guidelines for Handling Sensitive Issues in Kentucky's State Assessment Development*, was developed in 1995 to provide guidance for committees who develop test items for the Kentucky assessment. It addresses issues considered sensitive by the general public and, therefore, those issues should be avoided or carefully addressed on statewide assessment. The guidelines document was never intended to direct local curriculum. It is organized into two parts: questions to help determine the suitability of test items and issues that may be troublesome in various contexts.

The written document was produced in order to standardize the manner in which these sensitive issues were handled from year to year. These matters were addressed in previous years via oral presentation. The practices outlined in this document are not intended to prevent the instruction or measurement of sensitive material, but to assure that the measurement of such matters is carefully placed in the proper educational context. All large-scale test development procedures targeted at the elementary,

middle, and secondary school audience have formal procedures (either written or oral) designed to assist the item development procedure in handling sensitive matters.

Office of Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability staff members developed the sensitivity guidelines. The External Review Committee of the Office of Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability reviewed them. This committee included representatives of various interest groups such as the Kentucky Association of School Councils, Kentucky School Board Association, Kentucky Association of School Administrators, Kentucky Education Association, Kentucky PTA, Family Foundation, and the Office of Education Accountability.

The document has been used in connection with assessment development activities since 1996. It was available for review committees when Core Content for Assessment Version 1.0 was developed. Content Advisory Committees that draft and review test items have used the guidelines when preparing questions. Bias Review Committee members base their reviews of test items, illustrations, and reading passages on the sensitivity guidelines.

The sensitivity guidelines have been widely available through their posting on the Kentucky Department of Education Website. They also have been shared with various committees, such as the textbook review team.

Adjournment

Meeting adjournment.